arXiv:1409.7532v3 [math.AP] 27 Jan 2015

Liouville property, Wiener's test and unavoidable sets for Hunt processes

Wolfhard Hansen

Abstract

Let $(X, \mathcal{W})$ be a balayage space, $1 \in \mathcal{W}$, or – equivalently – let $\mathcal{W}$ be the set of excessive functions of a Hunt process on a locally compact space X with countable base such that $\mathcal{W}$ separates points, every function in $\mathcal{W}$ is the supremum of its continuous minorants and there exist strictly positive continuous $u, v \in \mathcal{W}$ such that $u/v \to 0$ at infinity. We suppose that there is a Green function $G > 0$ for X, a metric ρ for X and a decreasing function $g\colon [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty]$ having the doubling property such that $G \approx g \circ \rho$.

Assuming that the constant function 1 is harmonic and balls are relatively compact, is is shown that every positive harmonic function is constant (Liouville property) and that Wiener's test at infinity shows, if a given set A in X is unavoidable, that is, if the process hits A with probability one, wherever it starts.

An application yields that locally finite unions of pairwise disjoint balls $B(z, r_z)$, $z \in Z$, which have a certain separation property with respect to a suitable measure λ on X are unavoidable if and only if, for some/any point $x_0 \in X$, the series $\sum_{z \in Z} g(\rho(x_0, z))/g(r_z)$ diverges.

The results generalize and, exploiting a zero-one law for hitting probabilities, simplify recent work by S. Gardiner and M. Ghergu, A. Mimica and Z. Vondraček, and the author.

Keywords: Hunt process; balayage space; unavoidable set; zero-one law; Green function; equilibrium measure; capacity; doubling property; Liouville property; Wiener's criterion; Lévy process.

MSC: 31B15, 31C15, 31D05, 60J25, 60J45, 60J65, 60J75.

1 Preliminaries and main results

Let X be a locally compact space with countable base. Let $\mathcal{C}(X)$ denote the set of all continuous real functions on X and let $\mathcal{B}(X)$ be the set of all Borel measurable numerical functions on X. The set of all (positive) Radon measures on X will be denoted by $\mathcal{M}(X)$.

Moreover, let $\mathcal{W}$ be a convex cone of positive lower semicontinuous numerical functions on X such that $1 \in \mathcal{W}$ and $(X, \mathcal{W})$ is a balayage space (see [2], [6] or [11, Appendix]). In particular, the following holds:

(C) $\mathcal{W}$ separates the points in X,

$$w = \sup\{v \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{C}(X)\colon v \le w\} \qquad \text{for every } w \in \mathcal{W},$$

and there are strictly positive $u, v \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{C}(X)$ such that $u/v \to 0$ at infinity.

Then there exists a Hunt process $\mathfrak{X}$ on X such that $\mathcal{W}$ is the set $E_{\mathbb{P}}$ of excessive functions for the transition semigroup $\mathbb{P} = (P_t)_{t>0}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ (see [2, IV.7.6] or [11, Appendix]), that is,

$$\mathcal{W} = \{v \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)\colon \sup_{t>0} P_t v = v\}.$$

We note that, conversely, given any sub-Markov semigroup $\mathbb{P} = (P_t)_{t>0}$ on X such that (C) is satisfied by its convex cone $E_{\mathbb{P}}$ of excessive functions, $(X, E_{\mathbb{P}})$ is a balayage space, and $\mathbb{P}$ is the transition semigroup of a Hunt process (see [6, Corollary 2.3.8] or [11, Corollary A.5]).

For every numerical function f on X, let

$$R_f := \inf\{v \in \mathcal{W}\colon v \ge f\}.$$

In particular, for every subset A of X, we have reduced functions R_u^A, $u \in \mathcal{W}$, and reduced measures ε_x^A, $x \in X$, defined by

$$R_u^A := R_{1_A u} = \inf\{v \in \mathcal{W}\colon v \ge u \text{ on } A\} \quad \text{and} \quad \int u\, d\varepsilon_x^A = R_u^A(x).$$

Clearly, $R_u^A \le u$ on X and $R_u^A = u$ on A. If A is open, then

$$R_u^A \in \mathcal{W}. \tag{1.1}$$

For a general subset A, the greatest lower semicontinuous minorant $\hat{R}_1^A$ of R_1^A is contained in $\mathcal{W}$, and $\hat{R}_1^A = R_1^A$ on A^c (see [2, p. 243]).

If A is Borel measurable, then, for every $x \in X$,

$$R_1^A(x) = P^x[T_A < \infty], \tag{1.2}$$

where $T_A(\omega) := \inf\{t \ge 0\colon X_t(\omega) \in A\}$ and, more generally,

$$\varepsilon_x^A(B) = P^x[X_{T_A} \in B; T_A < \infty]$$

for every Borel measurable set B in X (see [2, VI.3.14]).

For every open set U in X, let $\mathcal{H}^+(U)$ denote the set of all functions $h \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$ which are *harmonic on* U (in the sense of [2]), that is, such that $h|_U \in \mathcal{C}(U)$ and

$$\varepsilon_x^{V^c}(h) := \int h\, d\varepsilon_x^{V^c} = h(x) \tag{1.3}$$

for every open V such that $x \in V$ and $\overline{V}$ is a compact in U. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(U)$ denote the (possibly larger) set of all $h \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$ such that (1.3) holds, whenever V is open, $x \in V$ and $\overline{V}$ is compact in U. By [2, VI.2.6]), for every set A in X,

$$R_u^A \in \mathcal{H}^+(X \setminus \overline{A}), \qquad \text{if } u \in \mathcal{W},\ u \le w \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{C}(X). \tag{1.4}$$

In the following let us assume that the constant function 1 *is harmonic on* X.

We recall that a subset A of X is called *unavoidable*, if $R_1^A = 1$ (or, equivalently, $\hat{R}_1^A = 1$). Otherwise, it is called *avoidable*, that is, A is avoidable, if there exists $x \in X$ such that $R_1^A(x) < 1$. The following zero-one law will play an important role (for its proof and the proof of the subsequent corollary see [11, Proposition 2.3]).

PROPOSITION 1.1. *For every* $A \subset X$,

$$R_1^A = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \inf_{x \in X} R_1^A(x) = 0. \tag{1.5}$$

COROLLARY 1.2. *If* $A \subset X$ *is unavoidable and* $B \subset X$, $\gamma > 0$ *such that* $R_1^B \geq \gamma$ *on* A, *then* B *is unavoidable.*

Moreover, we recall the following elementary fact (see [11, Lemma 2.2]).

PROPOSITION 1.3. *Let* A *be an unavoidable set in* X *and let* (B_n) *be a sequence of relatively compact sets in* X.[1] *Then the following hold.*

(a) *For every* $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *the set* $A \setminus (B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \cdots \cup B_n)$ *is unavoidable.*

(b) *If* $A \subset \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$, *then* $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} R_1^{B_n} = \infty$.

By definition, a *potential on* X is a function $p \in \mathcal{W}$ such that, for every relatively compact open set U in X, the function $R_p^{X \setminus U}$ is continuous and real on U and

$$\inf\{R_p^{X \setminus U} : U \text{ relatively compact open in } X\} = 0.$$

By [6, Proposition 4.2.10], a function $p \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{C}(X)$ is a potential if and only if there exists a strictly positive $q \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{C}(X)$ such that p/q vanishes at infinity. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of all continuous real potentials on X.

In the following let us assume that there is a Green function G for $(X, \mathcal{W})$ which is related to a metric for the topology of X:

ASSUMPTION 1.4. *We have a Borel measurable function* $G \colon X \times X \to (0, \infty]$ *and a metric* ρ *for* X *such that the following hold:*

(i) *For every* $y \in X$, $G(\cdot, y)$ *is a potential which is harmonic on* $X \setminus \{y\}$.

(ii) *For every potential* p *on* X, *there exists a measure* μ *on* X *such that*

$$p = G\mu := \int G(\cdot, y)\, d\mu(y). \tag{1.6}$$

(iii) *There exist a decreasing function* $g \colon [0, \infty) \to (0, \infty]$ *and a constant* $c \geq 1$ *such that*

$$c^{-1} g \circ \rho \leq G \leq c\, g \circ \rho.$$

REMARKS 1.5. 1. Having (i), each of the following properties implies (ii).

[1] It is easily seen that it is sufficient to assume that the the functions $R_1^{B_n}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are $\mathcal{P}$-bounded.

- G is lower semicontinuous on $X \times X$, continuous outside the diagonal, the potential kernel $V_0 := \int_0^\infty P_t\,dt$ of $\mathfrak{X}$ is proper, and there is a measure μ on X such that $V_0 f = \int G(\cdot, y) f(y)\,d\mu(y)$, $f \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$ (see [13] and [2, III.6.6]).
- G is locally bounded off the diagonal, each function $G(x, \cdot)$ is lower semicontinuous on X and continuous on $X \setminus \{x\}$, and there exists a measure ν on X such that $G\nu \in \mathcal{C}(X)$ and $\nu(U) > 0$, for every finely open $U \neq \emptyset$ (the latter holds, for example, if $V_0(x, \cdot) \ll \nu$, $x \in X$). See [10, Theorem 4.1].

2. For a discussion of (iii) and the later doubling property (1.11) see the Appendix.

The measure in (1.6) is uniquely determined and, given any measure μ on X such that $p := G\mu$ is a potential, the complement of the support of μ is the largest open set, where p is harmonic (see, for example, [10, Proposition 5.2 and Lemma 2.1]).

Suppose that A is a subset of X such that $\hat{R}_1^A$ is a potential. Then there is a unique measure μ_A on X, the *equilibrium measure for* A, such that

$$\hat{R}_1^A = G\mu_A.$$

If A is open, then $\hat{R}_1^A = R_1^A \in \mathcal{H}^+(X \setminus \overline{A})$, and hence μ_A is supported by $\overline{A}$. We observe that, for a general balayage space, this may already fail if A is compact (see [2, V.9.1]).

We define inner capacities for open sets U in X by

$$\operatorname{cap}_* U := \sup\bigl\{\|\mu\| \colon \mu \in \mathcal{M}(X),\ \mu(X \setminus U) = 0,\ G\mu \le 1\bigr\} \tag{1.7}$$

and outer capacities for arbitrary sets A in X by

$$\operatorname{cap}^* A := \inf\bigl\{\operatorname{cap}_* U \colon U \text{ open neighborhood of } A\bigr\}. \tag{1.8}$$

Of course, the function $U \mapsto \operatorname{cap}_* U$, U open in X, is increasing. Hence the function $A \mapsto \operatorname{cap}^* A$, $A \subset X$, is also increasing and $\operatorname{cap}^* A = \operatorname{cap}_* A$, if A is open. If $\operatorname{cap}_* A = \operatorname{cap}^* A$, we may simply write $\operatorname{cap} A$ and speak of the capacity of A.

The capacity of open sets U is essentially determined by the total mass of equilibrium measures for open sets which are relatively compact in U:

LEMMA 1.6. *For every open set U in X,*

$$\operatorname{cap} U \ge \sup\{\|\mu_V\| \colon V \text{ open and } \overline{V} \text{ compact in } U\} \ge c^{-2} \operatorname{cap} U.$$

Proof. The first inequality is trivial. To prove the second inequality, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu(X \setminus U) = 0$ and $G\mu \le 1$, and let K be a compact in U. We may choose an open neighborhood V of K such that $\overline{V}$ is compact in U. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|1_K \mu\| &= \int_K G\mu_V\,d\mu \le \int\int G(x,y)\,d\mu_V(y)\,d\mu(x) \\ &\le c^2 \int\int G(y,x)\,d\mu(x)\,d\mu_V(y) = c^2 \int G\mu(y)\,d\mu_V(y) \le c^2 \|\mu_V\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

For $x \in X$ and $0 < r < t$, we define balls $B(x,r)$ and shells $S(x,r,t)$ by

$$B(x,r) := \{y \in X : \rho(x,y) < r\}, \quad S(x,r,t) := \{y \in X : r \le \rho(x,y) < t\}.$$

Let us immediately note some elementary properties of $R_1^{B(x,r)}$ and $\operatorname{cap} B(x,r)$.

PROPOSITION 1.7. *Let $x \in X$, $r > 0$ and $B := B(x,r)$. Then R_1^B is a potential which is $\mathcal{P}$-bounded,*

$$R_1^B \le c\,\frac{G(\cdot,x)}{g(r)} \le c^2\,\frac{g(\rho(\cdot,x))}{g(r)}, \qquad \|\mu_B\| \vee \operatorname{cap} B \le cg(r)^{-1}, \tag{1.9}$$

$$R_1^B \ge c^{-1} \operatorname{cap} B \cdot g(\rho(\cdot,x) + r). \tag{1.10}$$

Proof. We know that $R_1^B \in \mathcal{W}$ (see (1.1)). Moreover, $G(\cdot,x)$ is a potential and $G(\cdot,x) \ge c^{-1}g(r)$ on B. Hence $R_1^B \le \min\{1, cG(\cdot,x)/g(r)\} \in \mathcal{P}$. In particular, R_1^B is a potential.

Moreover, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ such that $\mu(X \setminus \overline{B}) = 0$ and $\int G(\cdot,z)\,d\mu(z) = G\mu \le 1$. Since $c^{-1}g(r) \le G(x,\cdot)$ on $\overline{B}$, we see that $c^{-1}g(r)\|\mu\| \le 1$.

If even $\mu(X \setminus B) = 0$, then, by the minimum principle (see [2, III.6.6]), $R_1^B \ge G\mu$. Let $y \in X$. For all $z \in B$, $\rho(z,y) < \rho(y,x)+r$, and hence $G(y,z) \ge c^{-1}g(\rho(y,x)+r))$. Thus $R_1^B(y) \ge G\mu(y) \ge c^{-1}g(\rho(y,x)+r)\|\mu\|$. □

ASSUMPTION 1.8. *From now on we assume, in addition, the following.*

(iv) Doubling property*: There exist $c_D \ge 1$ and $0 \le R_0 < \infty$ such that*

$$g(r/2) \le c_D g(r) \qquad \text{for every } r > R_0. \tag{1.11}$$

(v) *All balls $B(x,r)$, $x \in X$, $r > 0$, are relatively compact.*

REMARKS 1.9. 1. We note that Assumptions 1.4 and 1.8 are satisfied by rather general isotropic Lévy processes (often with $R_0 = 0$; see [4] and [7] for details).

2. If (1.11) is known to hold with some $R_0 > 0$, then we may replace R_0 by any $R_0' \in (0, R_0)$ (at the expense of taking a larger c_D'), since $0 < R_0' < r \le R_0$ implies that $g(r/2) \le g(R_0'/2) \le g(R_0'/2)g(R_0)^{-1}g(r)$.

3. Since the function 1 is harmonic, X cannot be compact, and hence (v) implies that balls are proper subsets of X.

Having the doubling property for g, there is a close relation between estimates which are reverse to the ones in (1.9).

PROPOSITION 1.10. *Let $x \in X$, $r > R_0$, $B := B(x,r)$, $C \ge 1$, and $\tilde{C} := c^2 c_D C$. Then the following hold.*

(a) *If $\operatorname{cap} B \ge C^{-1}g(r)^{-1}$, then $R_1^B \ge \tilde{C}^{-1}G(\cdot,x)/g(r)$ on $X \setminus B$.*

(b) *If $R_1^B \ge C^{-1}G(\cdot,x)/g(r)$ on $X \setminus B$, then $\operatorname{cap} B \ge \tilde{C}^{-1}g(r)^{-1}$.*

Proof. (a) Immediate consequence of (1.10): it suffices to note that, for every $y \in B^c$, $\rho(y,x)+r \le 2\rho(y,x)$ and hence $g(\rho(y,x)+r) \ge c_D^{-1} g(\rho(y,x)) \ge (cc_D)^{-1} G(y,x)$.

(b) Let $z \in X \setminus B(x,2r)$, $a := \rho(x,z)$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists $0 < r' < r$ such that $V := B(x,r')$ satisfies $R_1^V(z) + \varepsilon > R_1^B(z) \ge (cC)^{-1} g(a)/g(r)$. Moreover,

$$R_1^V(z) = \int G(z,y)\, d\mu_V(y) \le c g(a/2) \|\mu_V\| \le c c_D g(a) \operatorname{cap} B,$$

since $a/2 \le a - r < \rho(z,\cdot)$ on B. Thus $\tilde{C}^{-1} g(r)^{-1} \le \operatorname{cap} B$. □

Our main theorems are the following.

THEOREM 1.11 (Liouville property)**.** *Every function in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(X)$ is constant.*

THEOREM 1.12 (Wiener's test)**.** *Let A be a subset of X, $x_0 \in X$, $R > 0$, $\gamma > 1$. Then A is unavoidable if and only if*

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap}^*(A \cap S(x_0, \gamma^n R, \gamma^{n+1} R)) = \infty. \tag{1.12}$$

For the next two corollaries we suppose, in addition, that we have a measure $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ with $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda) = X$ and such that, for some $c_0 \ge 1$, the normalized restrictions $\lambda_{B(x,r)} := (\lambda(B(x,r)))^{-1} 1_{B(x,r)} \lambda$ of λ on $B(x,r)$, $x \in X$, $r > R_0$, satisfy

$$G\lambda_{B(x,r)} \le c_0 g(r) \tag{1.13}$$

so that, in particular,

$$\operatorname{cap} B(x,r) \ge c_0^{-1} g(r)^{-1} \tag{1.14}$$

(for many Lévy processes, the Lebesgue measure will have this property; see [7]).

COROLLARY 1.13. *Let A be a union of pairwise disjoint balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z \in Z$, where $Z \subset X$ is locally finite and $r_z > 4R_0$, and let $x_0 \in X \setminus Z$ such that*

$$\inf\nolimits_{z,z'\in Z,\, z\ne z'} \frac{\lambda(B(z,\rho(z,z')/4))}{\lambda(B(x_0,4\rho(x_0,z)))} \cdot \frac{g(r_z)}{g(\rho(x_0,z))} > 0.$$

Then A is unavoidable if and only if $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z))/g(r_z) = \infty$.

DEFINITION 1.14. *We shall say that pairwise disjoint balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z \in Z$, are* regularly located *if the following hold:*

- *There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\rho(z,z') \ge \varepsilon$, for all $z, z' \in Z$, $z \ne z'$.*
- *There exists $R > 0$ such that every ball of radius R contains a point of Z.*
- *There exists a decreasing function $\phi\colon (0,\infty) \to (4R_0,\infty)$ and $C > 1$ such that*

$$\phi(\rho(x_0,z)) < r_z < C\phi(\rho(x_0,z)), \qquad z \in Z. \tag{1.15}$$

Under mild additional assumptions on λ (see Section 5), which are satisfied if $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, ρ is the Euclidean metric and λ is Lebesgue measure, the following holds.

COROLLARY 1.15. *Let A be a union of balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z \in Z$, in X which are regularly located. Then A is unavoidable if and only if $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z))/g(r_z) = \infty$.*

2 Liouville property

PROPOSITION 2.1. *Let U be an open set in X and $B := B(x_0, R)$, $x_0 \in U$, $R > R_0$, such that the closure of $B' := B(x_0, 2R)$ is contained in U. Then*

$$\sup h(B) \le (cc_D)^2 \inf h(B) \qquad \text{for every } h \in \mathcal{W} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(U). \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. We may choose $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{K}^+(X)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\varphi_n \uparrow 1_{X\setminus\overline{B'}} h$. Then

$$h_n := R_{\varphi_n} \in \mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{H}^+(X \setminus \operatorname{supp}(\varphi_n)), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N},$$

by [2, III.2.4, III.5.6]. So there exist measures μ_n on X, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$h_n = G\mu_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_n(B') = 0.$$

For all $x, y \in B$, and $z \in X \setminus B'$, $\rho(x,z) < R + \rho(x_0, z) \le 3(\rho(x_0,z) - R) < 3\rho(y,z)$, hence, defining $K := (cc_D)^2$, $G(x,z) \le cg(\rho(x,z)) \le cc_D^2 g(\rho(y,z)) \le KG(y,z)$ and

$$h_n(x) = \int G(x,z)\, d\mu_n(z) \le K \int G(y,z)\, d\mu_n(z) \le K h_n(y) \tag{2.2}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The sequence (h_n) is increasing to a function $u \in \mathcal{W}$ which, by (2.2), satisfies $\sup u(B) \le K \inf u(B)$. Clearly, $u \le h$ on X and $u = h$ on $X \setminus \overline{B'}$.

Let V be an open neighborhood of $\overline{B'}$ such that $\overline{V}$ is compact in U. Then $u \ge R_h^{V^c}$, since $V^c \subset X \setminus \overline{B'}$, and, for every $x \in V$, $u(x) \ge \varepsilon_x^{V^c}(h) = h(x)$. Thus $u = h$ completing the proof. □

COROLLARY 2.2 (Liouville property)**.** *Every function in $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(X)$ is constant.*

Proof. For every relatively compact open set V in X and every $f \in \mathcal{B}^+(X)$, the function $H_V f$ is lower semicontinuous on V (see [2, III.3.4]). Therefore $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(X) \subset \mathcal{W}$ (see, for example, [2, II.5.5]), and we obtain that (2.1) holds for all $h \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(X)$ and balls $B(x_0, r)$, $x_0 \in X$, $r > R_0$.

Now the claim follows immediately by a well known standard argument. (Let $h \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(X)$ and $a := \inf h(X)$. Then $h' := h - a \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^+(X)$. Given $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $x_0 \in X$ such that $h'(x_0) < \varepsilon$ and hence, considering $x \in X$ and $R > R_0 \vee \rho(x, x_0)$, we obtain that $h'(x) \le (cc_D)^2 h'(x_0) < (cc_D)^2 \varepsilon$. Thus $h' = 0$.) □

3 Proof of Wiener's test

One direction of Wiener's test is an easy consequence of Proposition 1.3(b). We only have to use the definition of cap* and note the simple fact that, for every open set V which is contained in an open ball, the reduced function R_1^V is a potential, by Proposition 1.7.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let A be an unavoidable set in X, $x_0 \in X$, $R > 0$, $\gamma > 1$. Then*

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap}^*(A \cap S(x_0, \gamma^n R, \gamma^{n+1} R)) = \infty.$$

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there are open neighborhoods U_n of $A_n := A \cap S(x_0, \gamma^n R, \gamma^{n+1} R)$ in $S(x_0, \gamma^n R/2, \gamma^{n+1} R)$ such that

$$\operatorname{cap} U_n \le \operatorname{cap}^* A_n + 2^{-n}. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $A \setminus B(x_0, \gamma R) \subset \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n$, we know, by Proposition 1.3, that

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{U_n} = \infty. \tag{3.2}$$

By [2, VI.1.7], there exist open sets V_n such that $\overline{V}_n$ is compact in U_n and

$$R_1^{U_n}(x_0) \le R_1^{V_n}(x_0) + 2^{-n}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then, by (3.2),

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{V_n}(x_0) = \infty.$$

Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma^{n_0} R/2 > R_0$. For $n \ge n_0$, let $\nu_n := \mu_{V_n}$, that is, $G\nu_n = R_1^{V_n}$. Since ν_n is supported by the set $\overline{V}_n$, which does not intersect $B(x_0, \gamma^n R/2)$, and

$$G(x_0, \cdot) \le c g(\rho(x_0, \cdot)) \le c g(\rho(\gamma^n R/2)) \le c c_D g(\gamma^n R) \quad \text{ on } X \setminus B(x_0, \gamma^n R/2),$$

we see that $R_1^{V_n}(x_0) = \int G(x_0, y) d\nu_n(y) \le c c_D g(\gamma^n R) \|\nu_n\| \le c c_D g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap} U_n$. Therefore

$$\infty = \sum\nolimits_{n\ge n_0} R_1^{V_n}(x_0) \le \sum\nolimits_{n\ge n_0} c c_D g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap} U_n.$$

Since $g(\gamma^n R) \le g(R) < \infty$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we finally conclude from (3.1) that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap}^* A_n = \infty$. □

Knowing that positive harmonic functions on X are constant, by Corollary 2.2, a set A in X is avoidable if and only if it is minimally thin at infinity (see [11, Proposition 2.3]). Therefore it suffices to modify the proofs for [2, V.4.15 and V.4.17] (characterizing, in the setting of Riesz potentials, thinness of a set A at a point). In the context of Lévy processes, this has already been noted (see, for example, [14, Proposition 7.3 and Corollary 7.4]). In our situation, the zero-one law will yield a straight forward modification.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let $A \subset X$, $x_0 \in X$, $s_n \in (0, \infty)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$ with $s_n \le \delta s_{n+1}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the following hold for the sets $A_n := A \cap S(x_0, s_n, s_{n+1})$:*

(i) *If A is unavoidable, then $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{A_n} = \infty$ on X.*

(ii) *If A is avoidable, then $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{A_n} < \infty$ on X.*

Proof. (i) Proposition 1.3, (b).

(ii) By Proposition 1.1, there exists a point $x_1 \in X$ such that $R_1^A(x_1) < (c^2 c_D)^{-1}$. By [2, VI.1.2], there exists an open neighborhood V of A such that

$$a := c^2 c_D R_1^V(x_1) < 1. \tag{3.3}$$

The Liouville property implies that R_1^V is a potential (see [11, Proposition 2.3]). Let

$$V_n := V \cap S(x_1, s_n, s_{n+3}), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $A_n \subset V_{n-1}$ if n is sufficiently large, it suffices to show that

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{V_n} < \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

To prove (3.4) let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 - \delta^{k-3} > 1/2$. We fix $1 \le i \le k$ and define

$$U_n := V_{i+nk}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It clearly suffices to show that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{U_n} < \infty$. Let $U := \bigcup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} U_n$. Since $R_1^U \le R_1^V$, R_1^U is a potential as well, $R_1^U = G\mu_U$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\mu_n := 1_{\overline{U}_n}\mu_U$$

so that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} G\mu_n = G\mu_U = R_1^U \le 1$.

Let $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $s_{n_0} > R_0$. For the moment, let us fix $n \ge n_0$, consider $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \ne n$, $y \in U_n$, and $z \in \overline{U}_m$. If $m < n$, then $\rho(y_1, z) \le \delta^{k-3}\rho(x_1, y)$. If $m > n$, then $\rho(x_1, y) \le \delta^{k-3}\rho(x_1, z)$. In both cases,

$$\rho(y, z) \ge (1 - \delta^{k-3})\rho(x_1, z) \ge \rho(x_1, z)/2.$$

Defining $\mu_n' := \mu_U - \mu_n = \sum_{m\ne n} \mu_m$ we hence obtain that, for every $y \in U_n$,

$$G\mu_n'(y) \le c \int g(\rho(y, z))\, d\mu_n'(z) \le cc_D \int g(\rho(x_1, z))\, d\mu_n'(z) \le c^2 c_D G\mu_n'(x_1) \le a.$$

Since $G\mu_n + G\mu_n' = G\mu_U = R_1^U$ and $R_1^U = 1$ on U, we therefore conclude that $1 - a \le G\mu_n$ on U_n, and hence

$$(1 - a)R_1^{U_n} \le G\mu_n.$$

Thus $\sum_{n\ge n_0} R_1^{U_n} \le (1 - a)^{-1} \sum_{n\ge n_0} G\mu_n \le (1 - a)^{-1} G\mu_U \le (1 - a)^{-1}$ completing the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.12. Let $A \subset X$, $x_0 \in X$, $R > 0$ and $\gamma > 1$.

If A is unavoidable, then (1.12) holds, by Proposition 3.1.

So let us assume that A is avoidable. By [2, VI.1.5], there exists an open neighborhood U of A which is avoidable. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$U_n := U \cap S(x_0, \gamma^{n-1}R, \gamma^{n+1}R)$$

is an open neighborhood of $A \cap S(x_0, \gamma^n R, \gamma^{n+1}R)$. By Proposition 3.2,

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} R_1^{U_n}(x_0) < \infty.$$

By Lemma 1.6, there exist open sets V_n in U_n such that $\overline{V}_n$ is compact in U_n and

$$\operatorname{cap} U_n \le c^2 \|\mu_{V_n}\| + 2^{-n}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma \le 2^k$, and let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma^n R > R_0$. Then $g(\gamma^n R) \le c_D^k g(\gamma^{n+1} R) \le c_D^k g(\rho(x_0, \cdot))$ on $\overline{V}_n$, and hence

$$g(\gamma^n R)\|\mu_{V_n}\| \le c_D^k \int g(\rho(x_0, y))\, d\mu_{V_n}(y) \le c c_D^k G\mu_{V_n}(x_0).$$

Since $G\mu_{V_n} = R_1^{V_n} \le R_1^{U_n}$ and $g(\gamma^n R) \le g(R)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we conclude that

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap} U_n < \infty.$$

Thus $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g(\gamma^n R) \operatorname{cap}^*(A \cap S(x_0, \gamma^n R, \gamma^{n+1} R)) < \infty$. □

4 Application to collections of balls having the separation property

COROLLARY 4.1. *Let $B(z, r_z)$, $z \in Z \subset X$, $r_z > 0$, be balls in X such that their union A is unavoidable. Then, for every $x_0 \in X$,*

$$\sum\nolimits_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0, z))/g(r_z) = \infty.$$

Proof. Propositions 1.3 and 1.7. □

The next simple result on comparison of potentials (cf. [7]) will be sufficient for us (see the proof of [11, Theorem 5.3] for a much more delicate version; cf. also the proof of [1, Theorem 3]).

LEMMA 4.2. *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be finite and $r_z > R_0$, $z \in Z$, such that, for $z \ne z'$, $B(z, r_z) \cap B(z', 3r_{z'}) = \emptyset$. Let $w \in \mathcal{W} \cap \mathcal{C}(X)$ and, for every $z \in Z$, let μ_z, ν_z be measures on $B(z, r_z)$ such that $G\mu_z \le w$, and $\|\mu_z\| \le \|\nu_z\|$. Then $\mu := \sum_{z\in Z} \mu_z$ and $\nu := \sum_{z\in Z} \nu_z$ satisfy*

$$G\mu \le w + c^2 c_D G\nu. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Let $z, z' \in Z$, $z' \ne z$, and $x \in B(z, r_z)$. For all $y, y' \in B(z', r_{z'})$, $\rho(y, y') < 2r_{z'} < \rho(x, y)$, hence $\rho(x, y') \le 2\rho(x, y)$, $g(\rho(x, y)) \le c_D g(2\rho(x, y)) \le c_D g(\rho(x, y'))$, and $G(x, y) \le c^2 c_D G(x, y')$. By integration, $G\mu_{z'}(x) \le c^2 c_D G\nu_{z'}(x)$. Therefore

$$G\mu(x) = G\mu_z(x) + \sum\nolimits_{z'\in Z, z'\ne z} G\mu_{z'}(x) \le w(x) + c^2 c_D G\nu(x).$$

Thus $G\mu \le w + c^2 c_D G\nu$ on the union A of the balls $B(z, r_z)$, $z \in Z$. By the minimum principle (see [2, III.6.6]), the proof is finished. □

LEMMA 4.3. *Let $x_0 \in X$, $R > 2R_0$ and $B := B(x_0, R)$. Suppose that there exist $C \ge 1$ and a probability measure λ on B such that $G\lambda \le C g(R)$. Let Z be a finite subset of $B(x_0, R/2)$ and $R_0 < r_z \le R/2$, $z \in Z$, such that the balls $B(z, 3r_z)$ are pairwise disjoint and, for some $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$,*

$$g(r_z)\lambda(B(z, \rho(z, z')/4)) \ge \varepsilon g(R), \qquad \text{whenever } z \ne z'. \tag{4.2}$$

Then the union A of the balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z\in Z$, satisfies

$$\operatorname{cap} A \ge \varepsilon(2c^3c_DC)^{-1}\sum\nolimits_{z\in Z}\operatorname{cap} B(z,r_z).$$

Proof. It clearly suffices to consider the case, where Z contains more than one point. Then, for $z\in Z$,

$$\tilde r_z := \max\bigl\{r_z, \operatorname{dist}(z, Z\setminus\{z\})/4\bigr\} \le R/2, \tag{4.3}$$

hence $B(z,\tilde r_z)\subset B$ and $\lambda(B(z,\tilde r_z))>0$, by (4.2). Further, $B(z,\tilde r_z)\cap B(z',3\tilde r_{z'})=\emptyset$, whenever $z\ne z'$,

For $z\in Z$, let $\mu_z\in\mathcal{M}(X)$ with $\mu_z(X\setminus B(z,r_z))=0$ and $G\mu_z\le 1$, and let

$$\alpha_z := \|\mu_z\|/\lambda(B(z,\tilde r_z)), \qquad \nu_z := \alpha_z 1_{B(z,\tilde r_z)}\lambda.$$

Then $\|\nu_z\|=\|\mu_z\|$ and, by Proposition 1.7, (4.3), and (4.2),

$$\alpha_z \le cg(r_z)^{-1}/\lambda(B(z,\tilde r_z)) \le c(\varepsilon g(R))^{-1}.$$

Since the balls $B(z,\tilde r_z)$, $z\in Z$, are pairwise disjoint subsets of B, the measure $\nu:=\sum_{z\in Z}\nu_z$ satisfies

$$G\nu \le c(\varepsilon g(R))^{-1}G\lambda \le cC\varepsilon^{-1}.$$

Let $\mu:=\sum_{z\in Z}\mu_z$. By Lemma 4.2, $G\mu\le 1+c^2c_DG\nu$. Thus $G\mu\le 2c^3c_DC\varepsilon^{-1}$. Since $\mu(X\setminus A)=0$, we see that $\operatorname{cap} A\ge\varepsilon(2c^3c_DC)^{-1}\sum_{z\in Z}\|\mu_z\|$ completing the proof. □

In addition to the Assumptions 1.4 and 1.8, we suppose the following.

ASSUMPTION 4.4. *We have a measure $\lambda\in\mathcal{M}(X)$ and a constant $c_0>0$ such that* $\operatorname{supp}(\lambda)=X$ *and, for all $x\in X$ and $r>R_0$,*

$$G\lambda_{B(x,r)} \le c_0 g(r) \tag{4.4}$$

(*where, as before, $\lambda_B:=\lambda(B)^{-1}1_B\lambda$ for every ball B*).

We already observed that then, for all $x\in X$ and $r>R_0$,

$$\operatorname{cap} B(x,r) \ge c_0^{-1}g(r)^{-1} \tag{4.5}$$

(see Proposition 1.7 for the corresponding upper estimate). By Proposition 1.10, such a lower estimate for the capacity of balls is equivalent to having inequalities $R_1^{B(x,r)}\ge C^{-1}G(\cdot,x)/g(r)$ on $X\setminus B(x,r)$ (which in turn, by the minimum principle, hold trivially if $(X,\mathcal{W})$ is a harmonic space, that is, if $\mathfrak{X}$ has no jumps).

Let us say that a family of pairwise disjoint balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z\in Z\subset X$, $r_z>2R_0$, has the *separation property with respect to* λ, if Z is locally finite and, for some point $x_0\in X\setminus Z$,

$$\inf\nolimits_{z,z'\in Z,z\ne z'}\frac{\lambda(B(z,\rho(z,z')/4))}{\lambda(B(x_0,4\rho(x_0,z)))}\cdot\frac{g(r_z)}{g(\rho(x_0,z))} > 0. \tag{4.6}$$

REMARK 4.5. If, for example, λ is Lebesgue measure on $X = \mathbb{R}^d$, $x_0 = 0$, $\rho(x,y) = |x-y|$, and $g(r) = r^{\alpha-d}$, then (4.6) means that

$$\inf_{z,z'\in Z, z\neq z'} \frac{|z-z'|^d}{|z|^\alpha r_z^{d-\alpha}} > 0,$$

which, in the classical case $\alpha = 2$, is the separation property in [3, Theorem 6].

THEOREM 4.6. *Let A be an avoidable union of pairwise disjoint balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z \in Z \subset X$, having the separation property with respect to λ. Then*

$$\sum\nolimits_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z)) \operatorname{cap} B(z,r_z) < \infty.$$

Proof. We may suppose that $\rho(x_0,z) > 4R_0$, for every $z \in Z$ (we simply omit finitely many points from Z). Moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that

$$r_z \le \rho(x_0,z)/2, \qquad \text{for every } z \in Z. \tag{4.7}$$

Indeed, replacing r_z by $r'_z := \min\{r_z, \rho(x_0,z)/2\}$ our assumptions are preserved. Suppose we have shown that $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z))/g(r'_z) < \infty$. Since $g(r)/g(r/2) \ge c_D^{-1}$ if $r > 2R_0$, the set Z' of all points $z \in Z$ such that $r'_z = \rho(x_0,z)/2$ is finite, and therefore $\sum_{z\in Z'} g(\rho(x_0,z))/g(r_z) < \infty$. So we may assume without loss of generality that $r'_z = r_z$, for all $z \in Z$, that is, (4.7) holds.

Further, we may assume that the balls $B(z,4r_z)$ are pairwise disjoint. Indeed, since $\operatorname{cap} B(z,r_z) \approx g(r_z)^{-1}$ and $g(r) \le g(r/4) \le c_D^2 g(r)$, $r > 2R_0$, a replacement of r_z by $r_z/4$ does neither affect (4.6) nor the convergence or divergence of $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z)) \operatorname{cap} B(z,r_z)$, and the new, smaller union is, of course, avoidable.

By (4.6), there exists $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ such that, for $z, z' \in Z$, $z \neq z'$,

$$g(r_z)\lambda(B(z,\rho(z,z')/4)) \ge \varepsilon g(\rho(x_0,z))\lambda(B(x_0,4\rho(x_0,z))). \tag{4.8}$$

Let $R > R_0$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$Z_n := Z \cap S(x_0, 2\cdot 8^n R, 4\cdot 8^n R) \quad \text{and} \quad A_n := \bigcup\nolimits_{z\in Z_n} B(z,r_z).$$

Then $A_n \subset A \cap S(x_0, 8^n R, 8^{n+1}R)$. Moreover, for every $z \in Z_n$, $\rho(x_0,z) \ge 8^n R$, and hence $g(\rho(x_0,z)) \le g(8^n R)$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 1.12,

$$\sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \sum\nolimits_{z\in Z_n} g(\rho(x_0,z)) \operatorname{cap} B(z,r_z) \le 2c^3 c_D c_0 \varepsilon^{-1} \sum\nolimits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} g(8^n R) \operatorname{cap}^*(A \cap S(x_0, 8^n R, 8^{n+1}R)) < \infty.$$

Applying this estimate as well to $2R$ and $4R$ in place of R we obtain that

$$\sum\nolimits_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z)) \operatorname{cap} B(z,r_z) < \infty.$$

□

COROLLARY 4.7. *For every union A of balls $B(z, r_z)$, $z \in Z \subset X$, having the separation property with respect to λ, the following statements are equivalent.*

(1) *The set A is unavoidable.*

(2) $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0, z)) \operatorname{cap} B(z, r_z) = \infty$.

(3) $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0, z))/g(r_z) = \infty$.

Proof. Corollary 4.1 and Theorem 4.6 using $\operatorname{cap} B(z, r_z) \approx g(r_z)^{-1}$, $z \in Z$. □

5 Application to regularly located balls

In this section we suppose as before that the Assumptions 1.4, 1.8, and 4.4 are satisfied. Moreover, let us assume that we have a distinguished point $x_0 \in X$ such that the measure λ has the following additional properties:

(i) For all $x, y \in X$ and $r > R_0$,

$$\lambda(B(y, r)) \le c_0 \lambda(B(x, r)). \tag{5.1}$$

(ii) There exist $C_D \in (1, \infty)$, $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ such that, for all $r > R_0$,

$$\lambda(B(x_0, 2r)) \le C_D \lambda(S(x_0, \kappa r, r)). \tag{5.2}$$

Let A be a union of balls $B(z, r_z)$, $z \in Z$, which is regularly located (see 1.14). We first prove the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 5.1. *Suppose that* $\limsup_{r\to\infty} \lambda(B(x_0, r))g(r)/g(\phi(r)) > 0$. *Then A is unavoidable.*

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that the radius R in (1.14) satisfies $R > \max\{1, \phi(1), R_0\}$. We define

$$a := (cc_0^2 C_D^5 \lambda(B(x_0, R))^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad b := cc_0^2 \lambda(B(x_0, R))^{-1}.$$

Let $0 < \beta < \limsup_{r\to\infty} \lambda(B(x_0, r))g(r)/g(\phi(r))$.

We now fix $x \in X$ and choose $r > \kappa^{-1}(4R + 2\rho(x_0, x))$ such that $r > \phi(r)$ and

$$\gamma := \lambda(B(x_0, r))g(r)/g(\phi(r)) > \beta. \tag{5.3}$$

Let

$$S := S(x_0, \kappa r/2, r/2), \qquad B := B(x_0, r) \quad \text{and} \quad r_0 := \phi(r)$$

so that

$$\gamma = \lambda(B)g(r)/g(r_0).$$

There are finitely many points $y_1, \dots, y_m \in \overline{S}$ such that $B(y_1, 3R), \dots, B(y_m, 3R)$ are pairwise disjoint and $\overline{S}$ is covered by $B(y_1, 9R), \dots, B(y_m, 9R)$. We may choose $z_j \in Z \cap B(y_j, R)$, $1 \le j \le m$. Then $\rho(z_i, z_j) \ge \rho(y_i, y_j) - 2R \ge 4R$, and hence

$$B(z_i, R) \cap B(z_j, 3R) = \emptyset, \tag{5.4}$$

for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ with $i \ne j$. Moreover,

$$\lambda(B) \le C_D \lambda(S) \le C_D \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{m} \lambda(B(y_j, 9R)) \le m C_D^5 c_0 \lambda(B(x_0, R)). \tag{5.5}$$

Let $1 \le j \le m$. Clearly,

$$r > r - R > r/2 + R \ge \rho(x_0, z_j) \ge \kappa r/2 - R \ge R \ge 1.$$

Therefore $B(z_j, R) \subset B$ and $r_0 = \phi(r) \le \phi(\rho(x_0, z_j)) < r_{z_j}$, hence $\overline{B}(z_j, r_0) \subset A$. Moreover, $r_0 \le \phi(1) \le R$ and $r_0 + \rho(x, z_j) \le R + \rho(x_0, x) + r/2 + R \le r$. So $g(\rho(x, z_j) + r_0) \ge g(r)$ and, by (1.10) and (4.5),

$$R_1^{B(z_j, r_0)}(x) \ge (cc_0)^{-1} g(\rho(x, z_j) + r_0)/g(r_0) \ge (cc_0)^{-1} g(r)/g(r_0). \tag{5.6}$$

Let μ_j be the equilibrium measure for $B(z_j, r_0)$, $1 \le j \le m$. We define

$$p := \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{m} R_1^{B(z_j, r_0)} = \sum\nolimits_{j=1}^{m} G\mu_j.$$

Then, by (5.6) and (5.5),

$$p(x) \ge m(cc_0)^{-1} g(r)/g(r_0) \ge a\gamma. \tag{5.7}$$

Finally, let $\nu := \sum_{j=1}^{m} \nu_j$, where

$$\nu_j := c g(r_0)^{-1} \lambda_{B(z_j, R)} \le c c_0 g(r_0)^{-1} \frac{\lambda(B)}{\lambda(B(x_0, R))}\, 1_{B(z_j, R)} \lambda_B.$$

Since $B(z_1, R), \dots, B(z_j, R)$ are pairwise disjoint subsets of B and $G\lambda_B \le c_0 g(r)$,

$$G\nu \le c c_0 g(r_0)^{-1} \frac{\lambda(B)}{\lambda(B(x_0, R))}\, G\lambda_B \le c c_0^2 \frac{\lambda(B)}{\lambda(B(x_0, R))}\, g(r)/g(r_0) = b\gamma.$$

By Proposition 1.7, $\|\mu_j\| \le c g(r_0)^{-1}$, $1 \le j \le m$. Thus, by (5.4) and Lemma 4.2,

$$p \le 1 + c^2 c_D G\nu \le 1 + c^2 c_D b\gamma.$$

Since μ is supported by the compact $\overline{B}(z_1, r_0) \cup \dots \cup \overline{B}(z_m, r_0)$ in A, this implies that

$$R_1^A \ge (1 + c^2 c_D b\gamma)^{-1} p,$$

by the minimum principle (see [2, III.6.6]). In particular,

$$R_1^A(x) \ge \frac{a\gamma}{1 + c^2 c_D b\gamma} = \frac{a}{\gamma^{-1} + c^2 c_D b} > \frac{a}{\beta^{-1} + c^2 c_D b},$$

by (5.7) and (5.3). Thus A is unavoidable, by Proposition 1.1. □

Proof of Corollary 1.15. If A is unavoidable, then $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z))/g(r_z)=\infty$, by Corollary 4.1.

To prove the converse, suppose that $\sum_{z\in Z} g(\rho(x_0,z))/g(r_z)=\infty$. By Proposition 5.1 and (5.2), it suffices to consider the case

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \lambda(B(x_0,4r))g(r)/g(\phi(r))=0. \tag{5.8}$$

Then $\inf_{r>0} g(\phi(r))\big(\lambda(B(x_0,4r))g(r)\big)\big)^{-1} > 0$. By (1.15), $g(\phi(r_z)) \approx g(\rho(x_0,z))$, $z\in Z$. Moreover,

$$\lambda(B(z,\rho(z,z')/4)) \geq \inf_{x\in X} \lambda(B(x,\varepsilon/4)) > 0,$$

whenever, $z,z'\in Z$, $z\neq z'$. So the balls $B(z,r_z)$, $z\in Z$, have the separation property, and A is unavoidable, by Corollary 4.7. □

6 Appendix

The following equivalences are of independent interest and may be useful in applications.

PROPOSITION 6.1. *Let X be an arbitrary set and $G\colon X\times X\to[0,\infty]$ such that $G=\infty$ on the diagonal and $0<G<\infty$ outside the diagonal. Then the following properties are equivalent:*

(i) *G has the* triangle property*: There exists $C\geq 1$ such that*

$$\min\{G(x,z),G(y,z)\}\leq CG(x,y), \qquad x,y,z\in X.$$

(ii) *There exists a metric ρ on X and $\gamma>0$ such that $G\approx\rho^{-\gamma}$.*

(iii) *There exist a metric ρ on X, a decreasing function $g\colon[0,\infty)\to(0,\infty]$, $c_D\geq 1$, and $\eta_0,\alpha_0\in(0,1)$ such that $G\approx g\circ\rho$ and, for every $r>0$,*

$$g(r/2)\leq c_D g(r) \quad \text{and} \quad g(r)\leq \eta_0 g(\alpha_0 r).$$

(iv) *There exist a metric ρ on X, a decreasing function $g\colon[0,\infty)\to(0,\infty]$, and $c_D\geq 1$ such that $G\approx g\circ\rho$ and $g(r/2)\leq c_D g(r)$ for every $r>0$.*

Proof. (i)$\Rightarrow$(ii): Since $G=\infty$ on the diagonal, the triangle property implies that $G(y,x)\leq CG(x,y)$ and $\tilde\rho(x,y):=G(x,y)^{-1}+G(y,x)^{-1}$, $x,y\in X$, defines a quasi-metric on X which is equivalent to G^{-1}. By [12, Proposition 14.5] (see also [8, pp. 1209–1212] and [5]), there exists a metric ρ for X and $\gamma>0$ such that $\tilde\rho\approx\rho^{\gamma}$, and hence $G\approx\rho^{-\gamma}$.

(ii)$\Rightarrow$(iii): Trivial defining $g(r):=r^{-\gamma}$.

(iii)$\Rightarrow$(iv): Trivial.

(iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i): Let $c > 0$ such that $c^{-1} g \circ \rho \leq G \leq c g \circ \rho$ and let $x, y, z \in X$. Since $\rho(x,y) \leq \rho(x,z) + \rho(y,z)$, we know that $\rho(x,z) \geq \rho(x,y)/2$ or $\rho(y,z) \geq \rho(x,y)/2$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{G(x,z), G(y,z)\} &\leq c \min\{g(\rho(x,z)), g(\rho(y,z))\} \\ &\leq c g(\rho(x,y)/2) \leq c c_D g(\rho(x,y)) \leq c^2 c_D G(x,y). \end{aligned}$$

□

REMARKS 6.2. 1. If X is a topological space and each function $G(\cdot, x)$, $x \in X$, is lower semicontinuous and bounded at infinity, the ρ is a metric for the topology of X.

2. If (iii) holds, then, for every $\eta \in (0,1)$, there exists $\alpha \in (0,1)$ such that $g(r) \leq \eta g(\alpha r)$. Indeed, it suffices to choose $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\eta_0^k < \eta$ and to take $\alpha := \alpha^k$.

References

[1] H. Aikawa and A.A. Borichev. Quasiadditivity and measure property of capacity and the tangential boundary behavior of harmonic functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 348:1013–1030, 1996.

[2] J. Bliedtner and W. Hansen. *Potential Theory – An Analytic and Probabilistic Approach to Balayage*. Universitext. Springer, Berlin, 1986.

[3] S.J. Gardiner and M. Ghergu. Champagne subregions of the unit ball with unavoidable bubbles. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math.*, 35(1):321–329, 2010.

[4] T. Grzywny. On Harnack inequality and Hölder regularity for isotropic unimodal Lévy processes. *Potential Anal.* 41: 1–29, 2014.

[5] W. Hansen. Uniform boundary Harnack principle and generalized triangle property. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 226: 452–484, 2005.

[6] W. Hansen. *Three views on potential theory*. A course at Charles University (Prague), Spring 2008. http://www.karlin.mff.cuni.cz/∼hansen/lecture/course-07012009.pdf.

[7] W. Hansen Unavoidable collections of balls for processes with isotropic unimodal Green function. In *Festschrift Masatoshi Fukushima* (eds. Z.-Q. Chen, N. Jacob, M. Takeda, T. Uemura), World Scientific Press, 2015.

[8] W. Hansen and I. Netuka. Convexity properties of harmonic measures. *Adv. Math.*, 218(4):1181–1223, 2008.

[9] W. Hansen and I. Netuka. Champagne subdomains with unavoidable bubbles. *Adv. Math.* 244:106–116, 2013.

[10] W. Hansen and I. Netuka. Representation of potentials. *Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl.*, 59: 93–104, 2014.

[11] W. Hansen and I. Netuka. Unavoidable sets and harmonic measures living on small sets. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 109: 1601–1629, 2014.

[12] J. Heinonen. *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces*. Springer, New York, 2001.

[13] H. Maagli. Représentation intégrale des potentiels. In *Séminaire de Théorie du Potentiel, Paris, No. 8*, volume 1235 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 114–119. Springer, Berlin, 1987.

[14] A. Mimica and Z. Vondraček. Unavoidable collections of balls for isotropic Lévy processes. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 124(3):1303–1334, 2014.

Wolfhard Hansen, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld, 33501 Bielefeld, Germany, e-mail: hansen@math.uni-bielefeld.de